

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY v.2

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

March 3, 2010

Richland, WA

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Welcome, introductions and announcements	1
Overview of the draft long-term stewardship plan at Hanford	1
Synthesis of feedback on the draft Program Plan	10
Next steps	10
Flipchart notes	10
Handouts.....	12

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.

Welcome, introductions and announcements

Susan Leckband, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Chair, thanked the group for participating in this important workshop about long-term stewardship and institutional controls. Introductions were made. Susan said long-term stewardship has been a priority topic for the Board for many years, and commented that the best long-term stewardship means none is needed.

Bob Suyama and Doug Mercer are the HAB issue managers for long-term stewardship. Bob said how the agencies and public choose to manage Hanford as a resource is important now and for future generations. Bob described different phases of stewardship, the first being during weapons productions when the land was not cared for. He said the next and current phase is cleanup. The decisions made now will define how much contamination is left in the ground. Bob said the third phase is long-term stewardship and managing the remaining contamination, and is the subject of this meeting.

Attendees were provided with copies of Board Advice # 141 *Long-Term Stewardship Program Plan* (2002) and the letter entitled *Institutional Controls and their Impacts on the Long-term Stewardship of the Hanford Site* (2009) that provides a summary of previous long-term stewardship advice. Bob said these illustrate the Board's unwavering and consistent values on long-term stewardship and institutional controls.

Doug Mercer said Advice #141 provided good insight into long-term stewardship as an activity that it will be ongoing through many generations. He thanked Boyd Hathaway, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), for his work on the subject. Doug said the 2010 Draft Long-Term Stewardship Program Plan was the clearest overview of long-term stewardship he has seen. Doug commented that it is a huge and difficult task.

Overview of the draft long-term stewardship plan at Hanford

Boyd Hathaway, DOE, provided an overview of the recently issued 2010 Draft Long-Term Stewardship Program Plan (Program Plan). The Program Plan describes key activities that comprise the long-term stewardship program at Hanford.

Boyd said it is a draft plan that will change over time. Jeff Frey, DOE-RL, said it was exciting to move into more clearly discussing long-term stewardship, and to see the Board's consistency through its past advice. He was proud that DOE and the community are moving forward with a bias for action, looking at River Corridor cleanup and not waiting for a national program to be established for long-term stewardship. He said it is important to get on with cleanup and clearly define long-term stewardship.

Boyd's presentation provided an overview of the purpose of the long-term stewardship program and Program Plan, and then addressed five questions posed by the issue managers.

Long-Term Stewardship Program activities

Long-term stewardship program activities include:

- Conduct administrative activities
- Conduct surveillance and maintenance of the remedies and their institutional controls
- Conduct surveillance and maintenance of completed natural resource damages restoration projects
- Conduct environmental monitoring and maintenance of the remedies
- Protect and manage Hanford Site resources
- Manage long-term stewardship information
- Conduct Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Five-Year Reviews
- Prepare for emergencies, contingency planning and corrective actions
- Manage post-cleanup completion infrastructure
- Ensure the safety and health of long-term stewardship workers
- Provide quality assurance
- Manage and budget necessary funding
- Interface with other Hanford programs
- Interface with external entities
- Improve the Long-Term Stewardship Program continuously

Boyd described the “what/when,” which is cleanup, surveillance and maintenance, and long-term stewardship. The “who” is River Corridor and Central Plateau, and mission support. He briefly described some of the responsibilities under each. Responsibilities under cleanup, for example, include defining long-term requirements and implementing remedies. Responsibilities under mission support include performing surveillance and maintenance of remedies and institutional controls. Boyd noted that the operations and maintenance for groundwater extraction and treatment systems that are determined to be operational and functional may be conducted by the long-term stewardship program even before remedial objectives are complete.

Boyd said they have been meeting regularly with HAB committees and issue managers.

Boyd reviewed how the Program Plan addresses the five questions from the HAB.

What is the purpose of the 2010 Program Plan?

- The Program Plan defines DOE's long-term responsibilities to maintain the protectiveness of cleanup remedies and protect resources and the environment
- It provides a framework for a site-wide long-term stewardship program to institutionalize and manage long-term stewardship across the Hanford Site
- It aligns with other Hanford cleanup documents
- The Program Plan serves as one of the implementing procedures and controls for the Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP)

How does the Program Plan affect decisions?

- It does not affect cleanup decisions or regulatory documents; it does implement their post-cleanup requirements
- It establishes the program to implement the post-cleanup requirements as defined through the CERCLA and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) processes
- It informs land use management decisions

What does the Program plan not do?

- It does not make cleanup remedy decisions
- It does not replace the CLUP
- It does not affect the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) process
- It does not serve as a primary Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) document

What topics does the Program Plan address?

- Background on long-term stewardship (Chapter 1); describes the framework and CLUP, decision documents and main objectives
- Planning for long-term stewardship (Chapter 2); describes the approach and demonstrates links to other documents
- Transition of land management responsibility (Chapter 3); discusses cleanup
- Long-term stewardship program implementation (Chapter 4)
- Long-term stewardship transition checklist (Appendix A); this is customized for Hanford

How does the draft 2010 Program Plan differ from the 2003 Program Plan?

The 2003 Program Plan:

- Focused on planning for the transition to long-term stewardship
- Identified the fundamental elements of long-term stewardship
- Assumed a 2035 cleanup timeframe

The 2010 Program Plan:

- Focuses on implementing long-term stewardship
- Defines the key long-term stewardship program activities
- Assumes a 2015 cleanup timeframe for portions of the site
- Incorporates practical experience gained at other sites
- Will institutionalize the long-term stewardship program

Jeff emphasized that DOE has cleanup contractors and mission support contractors. DOE specifically included in contracts that as cleanup is completed, responsibility for long-term stewardship will transition to Mission Support Alliance (MSA). He said that means DOE will need to be disciplined in institutionalizing a long-term stewardship plan and using it in contracts.

Boyd said DOE is looking for feedback on the Program Plan by April 9. Board members can send feedback to LTS@rl.gov. The Program Plan is available at www.hanford.gov/pageAction.cfm/Calendar. Additional long-term stewardship information can be found at www.hanford.gov/rl/?page=1365&paren.

Regulator perspective

Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), described EPA as in “listening mode” for long-term stewardship. She said they will be very involved with institutional controls and encouraged the Board’s work on this important issue.

Rick Bond, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), thought the Program Plan seemed fairly good. He said it is similar to past plans, and indicates that as much contamination should be cleaned up as possible. Rick noted that long-term funding is important. He said Ecology supports undertaking this long-term stewardship planning effort now.

Discussion

Pam Larsen asked about the transition of land ownership and management from DOE-Environmental Management (DOE-EM) and DOE’s Office of Legacy Management (DOE-LM). Boyd said transition meant from the DOE-RL cleanup program to the mission support arena. He said the local field offices will manage long-term stewardship for some time. He said DOE-LM does not want the property until the entire site is cleaned up, which includes completing WTP operations. Dave Brown, DOE, added that it is not DOE policy to transfer management to DOE-LM until the entire site is cleaned up.

Pam said institutional controls are incorporated into records of decision (RODs). Remedy selections are in RODs because of funding. Boyd said it is correct that they will use the CERCLA/RCRA processes for selecting institutional controls.

Doug Mercer thought there could be potential problems (e.g. insufficient funding) if DOE-LM is not involved earlier. He thought it would be easier to obtain money from Congress for long-term stewardship if it comes from DOE-LM rather than DOE-EM. Jeff agreed that it is good to look at ensuring funding is consistent into the future, but noted that the cleanup program currently has distinct funding sources and congressional support for the mission. He said success now will maintain support in the future. Jeff said he was confident that with the current elements in place, they will continue to have funding for the foreseeable future (the next few budget cycles).

Doug asked if Jeff is confident that the present arrangement of DOE-RL having budget responsibility for managing long-term stewardship works as well as if DOE-LM did. Jeff thought it was more certain for the near-term. Pam added that from her observations, Hanford is better served by staying under DOE-EM than DOE-LM. She said DOE-LM is underfunded and she expects they will be pulled back into DOE-EM. Pam thought that DOE-EM has fared well, politically.

Mike Korenko asked if the plan includes long-term public involvement components. He also asked if there is a cost estimate for long-term stewardship and how much it would cost in today's dollars. He said remedy selections today can be affected by a cost determination of long-term stewardship. He reiterated that Hanford needs to plan for long-term stewardship costs.

Mike noted that it is practically impossible to avoid using institutional controls in some situations. He was concerned about the vadose zone and said DOE needs to develop technology to treat it now. He was also concerned about not having a national repository for vitrified waste produced by the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP); if that problem is not solved now, storing those glass logs will fall under long-term stewardship. Hanford needs to discuss the repository issue.

Jeff said public involvement fits well in the long-term stewardship program. He did not know if Mike's concern about technology for treating the vadose zone and dealing with the repository issue will be included in the Program Plan, but the lifecycle report (required by the revised TPA) will look at those things. He said DOE will ask the public for input on strategic cleanup options, including how much waste will be processed and disposed of in the Central Plateau. Jeff said the lifecycle report will disclose lifecycles costs for cleanup activities required by the TPA. Jeff said DOE-RL and DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) are writing the lifecycle report with support from MSA. There will be a public outreach effort.

Norma Jean Germond commented that there should be a commitment to a continuous public oversight group at Hanford.

Maynard Plahuta said he would like to see an independent review of selected remedies, from a long-term stewardship perspective. He wanted to ensure that remedies include all long-term costs. He asked if people responsible for planning long-term stewardship at Hanford have any authority or leverage to ensure remedies are wisely selected (e.g. avoiding bigger long-term stewardship costs and impacts). Jeff said DOE is trying to maintain remedy decisions within the cleanup work scope, but as the long-term stewardship program becomes established, they will get better about knowing the cost and effectiveness of long-term stewardship. He said long-term stewardship staff does not have a role in remedy selection.

Maynard was concerned about DOE choosing a remedy that costs less today but costs more in the future, both in terms of money and impacts. He thought those people tasked with long-term stewardship planning should help those making remedy decisions. Susan Hayman captured the issue for follow-up.

Nancy Murray asked if other sites have transitioned into long-term stewardship from cleanup. Dave said yes, the most recent site is the Fernald Site in Ohio. Nancy asked if Hanford can learn from that site's successes and mistakes. Boyd said they are looking at lessons learned.

Pam said the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) should have a conference call with their stakeholder counterparts and agencies from Fernald and Rocky Flats to review lessons learned. Pam noted that Rocky Flats now has a local oversight committee for institutional controls.

Mike recommended that DOE reach out to and learn from other agencies, such as the U.S. Department of Defense.

Jean Vanni, from the audience, asked how will changes be made to the Program Plan if it is not a TPA document, and how disputes will be handled. Boyd said there is no set process for the plan, but they are taking and considering feedback. “Institutionalizing” the document means it is DOE’s responsibility to maintain remedies forever, so the Program Plan will be included in contracts to ensure it is carried over time. Jean commented that it seems like there is a gap in how NRDA is included in the Program Plan and the entire long-term stewardship process. She thought there was a disconnect in the presentation; DOE probably meant to say that remediation is a CERCLA process and restoration is a NRDA process.

Dirk Dunning said using long-term stewardship and institutional controls means that cleanup has fundamentally failed. There is no mechanism in place to ensure DOE-LM commitments are actually met. He asked if anyone expects there to be funding for the next 30,000 years. He provided a family history example to illustrate that most people do not even know their own family history from the past hundred years, let alone the geologic history of land. Dirk said more cleanup is needed in the near-term.

Dirk said decisions will be made based on the Central Plateau Cleanup Completion Strategy and the Program Plan, but they are not TPA decision documents. He believes this shows fundamental structural problems, as was encountered with the CLUP. Dirk said DOE sets its own land use plans that are outside of state law. He said they need to more fully discuss how the land will be managed in the future, including the various parties that will end up managing pieces of the land (e.g. U.S. Fish and Wildlife, local counties).

Laura Hanses asked how the Program Plan addresses cultural resources. Boyd said DOE will use a cultural resource protectiveness plan from the CLUP, which folds in land management responsibilities. Laura asked if cultural resources fall under long-term stewardship or if they are dealt with separately. Boyd said they are separate; what is done today with cultural resources will be done tomorrow. Long-term stewardship is being folded into existing processes.

Doug agreed with Dirk’s comments on relying on the CLUP as a primary decision document, funding and long-term memory. He thought Dirk’s comments were already included in the agenda questions and asked everyone to focus on those questions to ensure a constructive and productive discussion. He asked participants to ask questions that are within Boyd and Jeff’s scope. For example, the lifecycle report is outside their scope, so those questions could be better discussed at a different time. Dirk thought it was important to make broad comments, even if it is not in the long-term stewardship scope.

The group decided to focus its discussion on the five topics the issue managers previously identified.

The handoff between DOE-RL and DOE-LM

Dirk thought they should advise that responsibility should not be transferred from DOE-EM to DOE-LM.

Mike thought the TPA agencies should explore setting up a trust fund to ensure funding in the future.

Rob Davis said there are many potential scenarios where additional waste sites may be discovered. He commented that DOE should retain the ability to transfer responsibility back to DOE-EM if necessary.

Betty Tabbutt said she was concerned about the finality of a handoff, especially when new technologies could be developed to reduce the cumulative risk from long-term stewardship. Betty asked if there will be flexibility in a handoff; could responsibility be shifted back to DOE-EM from DOE-LM if necessary?

Jeff said individual decisions will be made through the CERCLA process. The Program Plan describes *how* DOE will approach the long-term stewardship phase, not *what* DOE will do. Jeff said the Program Plan indicates that DOE-EM and local control will be maintained well into the lifecycle until DOE-EM is confident that the site is cleaned up. Jeff understood the concern about possibly finding previously unknown waste sites, but noted that the areas of “low confidence” will be small and under the DOE-EM program until they have confidence in the cleanup.

Pam asked how DOE-ORP is involved with long-term stewardship and the Program Plan. Boyd said they are working with DOE-ORP during cleanup and restoration, and it was decided DOE-RL would take the lead on long-term stewardship. Jeff said the emphasis in the near-term is planning for long-term stewardship in the River Corridor, which is a DOE-RL function. Pam asked if it is tied to the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS). Jeff said the long-term stewardship program will incorporate all decision documents.

Barbara Harper commented that cleanup needs to continue to be planned from “cradle to grave,” and internal handoffs between DOE departments, contractors, and surveillance and maintenance programs need to be clearly coordinated.

Norma Jean said the plan should be flexible enough to shift responsibility back to DOE-EM if more cleanup is needed. Boyd said the Program Plan includes contingency plans. Norma Jean said long-term stewardship of the sites needs to be maintained by the strongest group with the most funding. She thought there should be a law to ensure Hanford long-term stewardship is funded into perpetuity.

Maynard commented that he did not see the concern about whether DOE-LM or DOE-EM is in charge of long-term stewardship. It is still all DOE’s responsibility. Jeff said the government will always be the responsible party. If additional remediation is necessary, the government will do it, whether it is DOE-EM or DOE-LM. Maynard said if DOE-LM finds a previously undiscovered waste site, they may clean it up themselves or have DOE-EM do it. He did not think it makes much of a difference. Boyd added that the Program Plan is flexible and necessary changes can be made.

Doug Mercer asked if DOE-LM accepted criteria works well for large sites like Hanford. Dave said that framework is a starting point. There will be site-specific transition criteria. Doug thought the Board should consider if adjustments to acceptance criteria for legacy management are necessary, so it can more effectively address large sites like Hanford and Savannah River. Boyd said they will customize the acceptance criteria for Hanford.

Doug asked if DOE is considering transitioning some areas of the Hanford Site to DOE-LM and long-term stewardship before all cleanup on site is complete. Jeff said they could pursue that if it made technical sense and if they had the support. He commented it probably does not make sense to break up the site, it is too interrelated. Rob thought DOE was already breaking up the site; contaminated groundwater is everywhere, yet it is being parceled out geographically.

Doug thought the Board might want to issue advice to DOE-HQ to evaluate the merits of DOE-LM acceptance criteria and the relative costs.

Laura commented that the 300 Area most likely remain under DOE-EM management until the entire rest of the site is complete. She asked who will manage the 300 Area. Boyd noted that when DOE-RL talks about shrinking the footprint (in the DOE-RL 2015 Vision, for example) they mean shrinking the cleanup footprint, not the whole site. DOE will continue to own and maintain the entire site into the foreseeable future.

Rob thought there should be some technical acceptance criteria. He considered the goal of shrinking the footprint by 2015 (DOE-RL’s 2015 Vision) a political date, not a technical date. He thought a third party evaluation of acceptance criteria would help ensure that politics do not overrun technical realities. Boyd said that will be the focus of the acceptance criteria checklist. Rob wanted to ensure that the TPA agencies agree and public agree to the technical conditions of a turnover. Boyd noted that some of that will result from a remedy decision as well.

Dirk said the Board should advise that the plan should be based only on decision documents. Dirk thought the real question is how long the federal government will maintain control of the land, instead of debating what current office of what department will be in charge. He said they need to focus on the long-term implications of remedy selection.

Doug said the Program Plan and CLUP are based on federal ownership into perpetuity. He thought the Board should consider advising that there be an alternative assumption that the federal government does *not* own the land in perpetuity.

The assumption of federal ownership for the foreseeable future

Boyd noted that the plan does not speak to the assumption of federal ownership for the foreseeable future. Jeff said that is the current assumption, though. Dave added that there is not anything in the plan that would change the assumption. Boyd said long-term stewardship is based on CERCLA and RCRA processes and their tools; it does not matter who owns it, DOE is still the responsible party to ensure cleanup remedies work.

Mike said DOE's strategy for long-term stewardship should be consistent. He thought Inés Triay, DOE-EM assistant secretary, implied that there would be a transition of ownership from the federal government to other entities, like local governments or businesses for an energy park, an economic development zone or a national park. He said DOE could end up leasing the land and added that, with private investment money, DOE would not see a dime if it asks private business to assume liability. Mike said there needs to be a link between strategy and future ownership; stewardship regulations would be different for a dedicated economic development zone than for empty land. Jeff said the Program Plan refers to the CLUP, which designates land use and defines areas of land that could be available for industrial use. DOE would maintain control but could be able to lease certain areas. Jeff said as they look at opportunities for energy parks, for example, their intention is to be consistent with the CLUP.

Mike said it would be useful to communicate that DOE will maintain control. He thought that was important for the public to understand. He said DOE needs to assume risk for long-term viability in order to get private dollars for development.

Pam challenged the notion that DOE will own all the land that was once the Hanford Site into the future. She thought they would probably own most but not all. She said Inés Triay stated that she wants the land released. Pam said the Tri-Cities community wants to use some of the land for a private energy park, but private companies will not locate there if they do not own the land.

Jeff appreciated the group's comments and encouraged them to focus on and provide comments on the Program Plan. He said the plan will not make any ownership decisions.

Harold Heacock said when the Hanford Reach National Monument was established, there was a clause that said when the land becomes excess, DOE has to turn it over to the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife for management. He asked if DOE will turn land over to other agencies. Boyd said he would have to read the proclamation, but he thought there is a separate memo from the U.S. Department of the Interior that asks DOE to consider additional lands for the national monument. Boyd noted that is outside the scope of the Program Plan. Harold thought whether or not DOE retains the land is a fundamental issue. Susan Hayman thought that was a topic beyond the Program Plan and noted it as a future issue to discuss.

Doug thought it seemed clear that DOE is using the CLUP as a key decision document, and that it provides the framework for how decisions are made for the Hanford Site. He thought the Board should study it. Doug said the CLUP is not the kind of land use plan that is required under the Growth Management Act, which requires the Tri-Cities to plan for future growth. The Program Plan indicates that stewardship will conform to regulatory requirements, including CERCLA, RCRA and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) where potentially applicable. Doug asked if there will be a process to revise the CLUP in concert with regional planners. Boyd said the Growth Management Act requires local governments to develop a land use plan. There is also legislation for federal land. Boyd said the principles are the same, and that the

local counties mirrored the CLUP. Doug asked if Boyd was satisfied with the reconciliation between the CLUP and counties' plans. Boyd did not think there were many differences.

Pam said she used to work on land use plans for the county, and said it is correct that the county's land use plan is similar to the CLUP. She said they should discuss if industries will actually want to use areas at Hanford designated for industrial use. Pam said there is a lot of industrial land in the Columbia Basin, and industries did not want to locate at former Hanford land if DOE continues to own it. She thought it would be useful to have city and county planners participate in a discussion about it with RAP.

Doug reiterated that DOE should examine an alternative assumption of a future for the Hanford Site without federal ownership. He added that the Board should discuss at some point alternative concepts of property law. He said it has implications on long-term stewardship. Doug thought that property should be conceptualized as a commons.

Dirk commented on the complex interplay of treaties and laws at the federal and state level. He said DOE is incorrectly assuming that they will maintain control of the land in perpetuity. He did not think that will happen. He also thought RAP should discuss the reintroduction of native bird species (e.g. sage-grouse) onto sagebrush steppe habitats, which may have impacts to long-term stewardship plans.

Liz asked if DOE is considering disaster scenarios and how they relate to long-term stewardship and DOE assumptions. Boyd said the Program Plan does not evaluate disaster scenarios, but does discuss remedy failures and processes that need to be in place during surveillance and maintenance. Susan Hayman said that could be added to the list of future discussion topics.

Liz commented that stewardship is ongoing, not just designated as long-term or short term. It is all interrelated.

Betty thought the key point was that the federal government will be responsible for cleanup regardless of if they continue to own or manage the land.

The need for DOE to estimate and fund the future costs of long-term stewardship

Susan Leckband thought the group should look at Advice #141 because it specifically addresses this topic. She felt the Board has been very consistent on this issue.

Mike thought the Board should advise that DOE look at alternate funding vehicles.

Doug thought advice #141 does not really address estimating long-term stewardship costs.

Jeff said the plan outlines how costs will be estimated and provided as part of the regulatory decision-making process. He said before that point, DOE will have to make some assumptions.

Doug asked about the formal role for public participation in the development of those assumptions and estimates for long-term stewardship. Jeff said the public will be able to review and provide comment on the alternatives presented in draft RODs, including costs associated with various alternatives. Doug said the lifecycle report is part of the TPA, and asked how the public will be able to comment on it, before a ROD is drafted. This issue was added to the list of issues for future discussion.

Maynard wanted to see the roles and responsibilities of respective parties in the plan. He asked if those responsible for long-term stewardship planning will have a role in evaluating the cost estimates in decision documents. Jeff said not yet, but they would have ownership of lifecycle cost projections for long-term stewardship in the future. He said right now it is the program and projects responsibility to identify the cost of cleanup and ongoing institutional controls. Maynard thought the long-term stewardship teams should have a role to plan in evaluating costs.

Boyd said the Program Plan includes accountability between the cleanup organizations. He said MSA will act almost as a third party, to ensure remedies are met. He said they want to prove remedy effectiveness before handing over site management. Maynard said that should be clearer in the Program Plan.

Mike said they should be cautious about using lifecycle costs and cash flow. He said present value accounting will not work for long-term stewardship; DOE should look at incremental cash flow.

Rob said funding needs to be linked to seeking and implementing new technologies.

The need to monitor and maintain controls (physical and administrative) to ensure remedies remain protective for the long-term

Dave said the Program Plan lays out how DOE will monitor and meet monitoring requirements.

Dirk said the plan is aimed at surveillance and maintenance. He said some places will need to be actively guarded forever at Hanford. Dirk said that will be very costly, and will need to be flat funded into the future.

Susan Leckband said two national workshops on long-term stewardship identified that maintaining activity at cleanup sites is one of the primary elements to ensuring people are safe from residual contamination. She said a human presence needs to be maintained to pass along institutional knowledge.

Liz asked if monitoring will occur downstream of the Columbia River, since contaminants will continue to leave the site. Maynard said DOE has consistently monitored downstream from Hanford. He assumed that monitoring responsibility will remain with the government. Jeff said yes, CERCLA requires “cradle to grave” monitoring of Hanford Site contamination. DOE is responsible for risk beyond the site boundary and monitors for contaminant migration. Liz thought that should be more clearly identified in the Program Plan. She also thought DOE should do more to prevent contaminants from leaving the site.

The need to preserve and maintain information for the long-term (so people in the future will “know it is there”)

Jeff said this is covered in the section about managing long-term stewardship information on page 22 of the Program Plan.

Nancy thought the Board provided solid advice on this topic in Advice #141 from 2002.

Liz thought HAB advice is a good example of how challenging it is to maintain and remember information. She said it will be very difficult to track information at Hanford over time, especially with turnover of people. She said DOE should better describe in the plan how they will maintain and retain knowledge and records.

Bob said records are very difficult to maintain, especially as technology changes. He said data was stored on seven track tapes at the Fast Flux Testing Facility (FFTF). Bob said the budget went away and they lost the capability to rerun those tapes; data is being lost because of the way the tapes age.

The group thought the Program Plan should better describe the record retention process and how it will be accessible in the future. The plan for retention should be established now. Boyd said DOE is currently working on this. Dave said it is tied in to the overall DOE-RL information management strategy.

Dirk said in general, records are periodically destroyed due to space. He thought Hanford should not destroy any records; there should be a permanent archive to help maintain knowledge across thousands of generations.

Norma Jean said people are the only thing to be relied upon (not records).

Maynard said DOE needs its own internal process to maintain records and data.

Susan Leckband said RAP should receive information on the Hanford long-term stewardship information management plan as it is developed, in addition to their regular updates on the Program Plan in general.

Doug proposed that the best opportunity to institutionalize knowledge and memory is to make the B Reactor Museum a site of continued active engagement on Hanford issues. He said the B Reactor Museum specifically is the number one way to institutionalize long-term stewardship and memory into perpetuity.

Synthesis of feedback on the draft Program Plan

The purpose of this is agenda item was to identify the key elements of the feedback, and determine if Board advice is warranted.

Bob said the first priority is to provide advice to DOE on the Program Plan. He said there are bigger picture issues on which the Board may wish to issue advice, such as near-term activities that apply to RODs or the long-term stewardship tool box that could provide a set of questions to contemplate when selecting a remedy.

Doug said the plan's scope is ambitious, and does a good job in showing the attempted scope. He thought long-term stewardship still feels segregated. He thought the Board should ensure it references past advice in whatever advice that RAP develops based on this COTW discussion. Doug said the assumption of continued federal ownership is not viable, and true costs need to be addressed. Doug reviewed more of the main points from the group's earlier discussion. He said they need specific assessments of long-term stewardship plans, and should avoid getting sidetracked with existential anxieties.

Harold thought the five questions identified by the issue managers to frame the day's discussion captures the policy values. He asked that the advice be at a policy level rather than a how-to.

The group decided to state that the Program Plan should be based only on decision documents. The CLUP is not a decision document.

DOE will be at the RAP meeting next week. The group thanked Boyd and Jeff for working with the issue managers and for their openness.

Susan Hayman asked the group to frame advice points specific to the Program Plan. The group identified which notes from the flipcharts that issue managers should further develop into draft advice, which will be brought forward to the RAP meeting next week. The draft advice will be developed for the April Board meeting so it can be submitted to DOE by the April 9 deadline for feedback.

Next steps

Bob and Doug, long-term stewardship issue managers, will provide draft advice points generated by the COTW meeting to RAP. RAP will take the draft concepts identified from this meeting and develop draft advice on the Program Plan for Board consideration. They will:

1. Identify near-term advice points for the plan
2. Identify advice points for broader, national consideration for long-term stewardship
3. Identify advice points on near-term activities that apply to RODs (e.g. stewardship toolbox)

Flipchart notes

General feedback, comments or background for advice points on Program Plan

- How to return land back to EM? (graded approach – pg 10, 2.1)
 - How does potential hand off occur?
 - Need to clarify this in document

- Clarify relationship between WAC & CLUP (requirements, compliance)
- Would like to see DOE responsible for risk/contaminants beyond site – state this more visibly in plan (include what monitoring occurs of “DOE” no longer an entity; better communicate that DOE will maintain control/assume risk for LT liability; clarify federal government responsible for cleanup of new discoveries; challenge the notion that DOE will “own” land forever (advice point))
- Better describe record retention – knowledge transference process & how it will be accessible in the future (e.g. conversion of 7-track tapes) (pg 22 second bullet) – when will plan and management be ready to implement? (schedule?)
- Reflect language specifically from HAB advice in the plan (background for advice)

Potential advice

- Funding in perpetuity
- Pg 17 would like to see incorporation of “technical” issues (e.g. 2015 date) – “Technical Acceptance Criteria” (with stakeholder support)
- Address possibility of other ownerships beyond federal
- Should be a link between DOE strategy and LTS (i.e. as it speaks to ownership)
- Define roles and responsibilities for reviewing estimated cost in decision document (before decision is made) – Independent role. (not clear in plan right now); concern with use of present value accounting
- Linkage that would seek, fund, develop & implement new technology
- Currently aimed at surveillance and maintenance – plan needs to reflect need for active, guarded security (human presence)
- Add own surveillance and maintenance bullet to review DOE internal process
- Identify ways to keep people engaged in knowledge transfer (e.g. #1 – B Reactor – Manhattan Project Site)
- Don’t hand off the site to LM
- How to address discovery of new site for cleanup
- Evaluating merits of LM acceptance criteria (advice to HQ) (advice point); how does this “internal handoff work? RL/ORP, contractor to contractor, transition plans, how to get in and out of LTS; plan should include flexibility to address discovery of new sites (comment)
- Plan should be based on decision documents (may already be in there)
- Option for other than federal ownership for foreseeable future
- Look at advice bullet (1st) #141 (cost issue)
- Look at other vehicles to fund?
- Moratorium on record destruction
- B Reactor – Manhattan Project – value as “Human component” for LTS
- Make LTS a decision document

Bin

- Long-term public involvement
- Vadose zone, long-term repository/ cost and other ramifications to LTS (Input into life-cycle cost?)
- Opportunity for “independent review” of remedy selection by LTS staff to weigh in on LTS ramifications of decisions
- Lessons learned – opportunities to hear from other sites
- Process for making changes to LTS Plan in future
- Where does NRDA fit in LTS process? (slide 3/9)
- Continuous “oversight” public involvement group
- Structurally based on non-decision documents
- Relationship (dependence) to land use plans (including county plans, state plans)
- LTS trustee action

Topics beyond Program Plan

- Federal US private ownership (local development opps)
- Ownership of land per Hanford Reach Proclamation N.M.

- Review CLUP and its importance to LTS/land use planning
- Other ways are thinking about public property (“commons”)
- Sage Grouse reintroduction (DOI) – potential on Hanford Site (concern from DOE)
- Disaster scenario planning & implications to LTS
- Attending to “Short-term stewardship”
- How to involve the public in determinations of cost before ROD signed (implications to LTS)

RAP follow-up

- RAP – follow up “virtual meeting” of stakeholders/regulators at other sites transitioned to LTS including other superfund sites
- RAP receive info on Hanford LTS information as it is developed & implemented
- Review CLUP/Land use planning concepts

Handouts

Copies of meeting handouts can be obtained through the Hanford Advisory Board Administrator at (509) 942-1906, or tgilley@enviroissues.com

- Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Program presentation, Boyd Hathaway (March 3, 2010)
- Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Program Plan, preliminary draft, Revision C (February 25, 2010)
- HAB Advice #141, Long-Term Stewardship Program Plan (December 6, 2002)
- HAB letter 2009O-01, Institutional Controls and their Impact on the Long-Term Stewardship of the Hanford Site (February 6, 2009)

ATTENDEES

HAB members and alternates

Rob Davis	Mike Korenko	Nancy Murray
Sam Dechter	Pam Larsen	Maynard Plahuta
Dirk Dunning	Susan Leckband	Betty Tabbutt
Norma Jean Germond	Liz Mattson	Bob Suyama
Laura Hanses	Doug Mercer	
Harold Heacock		

Others

Rick Bond, Ecology	Ed Yancey, MSA	Rico Cruz, CTUIR
Jeff Frey, DOE-RL	Raja Ranade, MSA	Barbara Harper, CTUIR
Boyd Hathaway, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, MSA	Joe Bartoszek, US FWS
John Sands, DOE-RL	Sonya Moore, MSA	Jean Vanni, Yakama Nation ERWM
Dave Brown, DOE-ORP	Barb Wise, MSA	
Emy Laija, EPA	Dale McKenney, CHPRC	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
	Marc Jewett, CHPRC	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
	Janice Williams, CHPRC	
	Dale Bignell, WCH	